

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 12, 15, 16, 18, and 19 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 12, 16, 18, and 19 are currently amended. Claims 2, 3, 8, 11, 14, and 17 are cancelled by this amendment. No claims are newly added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3 and 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu, et al., "A BGP/GMPLS Solution for Inter-Domain Optical Networking," ETF Draft, June 2002 ("Xu") in view of Rajagopalan, et al., "IP over Optical Networks: A Framework – Second Draft Version," 6 June 2002, Internet Engineering Task Force, pp. 1-41 ("Rajagopalan") and Kompella, et al. "OSPF Extensions in Support of Generalized MPLS, Network Working Group – Internet draft, July 2001, pp. 1-9 ("Kompella").

It is believed that the previously presented claims are patentably distinct over these references. Notwithstanding, independent Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the features of the present invention. More specifically, Claim 1 recites "wherein the routing protocols for exchanging route information among the external IP networks are activated among the optical network control instances in the edge routers to which the external IP networks are connected, wherein the Border Gateway Protocols (BGPs) are used for protocols for exchanging the route information of the external IP networks, and wherein the optical paths are wavelength paths" and in

combination with the other elements recited in the claim. Applicant asserts that these features are not taught by the combination of applied references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Claims 16 and 18 further recites that “the communication lines are Synchronous Optical Network/Synchronous Digital Hierarchy (SONET/SDH) lines”. For this additional reason, it is respectfully submitted that these claims define patentable subject matter.

Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Xu in view of Rajagopalan, Kompella, Jagannath (U.S. Pat. No. 6,483,833 B1; “Jagannath”), and Francisco, et al. “Interdomain Routing in Optical Networks,” Proceedings of SPIE Opticomm, August 2001, pp. 1-10 (“Francisco”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is believed that the previously presented claims are patentably distinct over these references. Notwithstanding, claims 4 and 5 have been amended to more clearly define the features of the present invention. For example, these claims recite that “the optical paths are wavelength paths” and in combination with the other elements recited in the claim. Applicant asserts that these features are not taught by the combination of applied references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant’s claimed invention defines patentable subject matter.

Claims 6, 9, 12, and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosen, et al., “Multiprotocol Label Switching Architecture,” Internet Engineering Task Force, July 2000 (“Rosen”) in view of Sasagawa (U.S. Pat. No. 7,336,648 B1; “Sasagawa”) and Xu. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is believed that the previously presented claims are patentably distinct over these references. Notwithstanding, claims 6, 9, and 12 have been amended to more clearly define the features of the present invention. For example, claim 6 recites “wherein correspondence information with respect to the ingress-side IP address and its corresponding identifiers are exchanged among the edge routers by control signals and wherein the optical paths are wavelength paths” in combination with the other elements recited in the claim. Similarly, Claims 9 and 12 recite “a section for exchanging information, in which the ingress-side IP addresses correspond to the identifiers, among other edge routers mutually by control signals, and wherein the section for maintaining the lists has a section for generating or updating the lists in accordance with the information obtained by the exchanging section with respect to the correspondence information between the ingress-side IP addresses and the identifiers, wherein the optical paths are wavelength paths” in combination with the other elements recited in the claim. Applicant asserts that these features are not taught by the combination of applied references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant’s claimed invention defines patentable subject matter.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 23, 2010

By: /Timothy D. MacIntyre/_____
Timothy D. MacIntyre
Reg. No. 42,824

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

TDM/dec